arXiv:1603.07685v1 [math.CA] 23 Mar 2016

HARDY SPACES FOR BESSEL-SCHRÖDINGER OPERATORS

EDYTA KANIA AND MARCIN PREISNER

Abstract. Consider the Bessel operator with a potential on $L^2((0,\infty), x^\alpha\,dx)$, namely

$$\mathbf{L}f(x) = -f''(x) - \frac{\alpha}{x}f'(x) + V(x)f(x).$$

We assume that $\alpha > 0$ and $V \in L^1_{loc}((0,\infty), x^\alpha\,dx)$ is a non-negative function. By definition, a function $f \in L^1((0,\infty), x^\alpha\,dx)$ belongs to the Hardy space $\mathcal{H}^1(\mathbf{L})$ if

$$\sup_{t>0}\left|e^{-t\mathbf{L}}f\right| \in L^1((0,\infty), x^\alpha\,dx).$$

Under certain assumptions on V we characterize the space $\mathcal{H}^1(\mathbf{L})$ in terms of atomic decompositions of local type. In the second part we prove that this characterization can be applied to $\mathbf{L}$ for $\alpha \in (0,1)$ with no additional assumptions on the potential V.

1. Introduction

1.1. **Background.** The Schrödinger operator on $\mathbb{R}^d$ is given by

$$\widetilde{\mathcal{L}}f = -\Delta f + \mathcal{V}\cdot f,$$

where Δ is the Laplace operator and $\mathcal{V}$ is a function called a potential. If we assume that $\mathcal{V} \in L^1_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and $\mathcal{V} \geq 0$ then one can find a densely defined, self-adjoint operator $\mathcal{L}$ on $L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$, that corresponds to $\widetilde{\mathcal{L}}$. It is well known that $\mathcal{L}$ generates the semigroup of contractions $\mathcal{K}_t = \exp(-t\mathcal{L})$ and $\mathcal{K}_t$ admits an integral kernel $\mathcal{K}_t(x,y)$ such that

$$\mathcal{K}_t f(x) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \mathcal{K}_t(x,y)f(y)dy,$$

$$0 \leq \mathcal{K}_t(x,y) \leq (4\pi t)^{-d/2}\exp\left(-\frac{|x-y|^2}{4t}\right).$$

There have been wide studies on harmonic analysis related to Schrödinger operators and, more generally, operators with Gaussian bounds. We refer the reader to [1], [2], [3], [5], [7], [8], [9], [10], [11], [12], [14], [15], [16], [17], [18], [20], [21], [25], and references therein. In particular, the Hardy spaces

$$H^1(\mathcal{L}) = \left\{ f \in L^1(\mathbb{R}^d) \ : \ \|f\|_{H^1(\mathcal{L})} := \left\| \sup_{t>0} |\mathcal{K}_t f| \right\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^d)} < \infty \right\} \tag{1.1}$$

related to $\mathcal{L}$ were intensively studied. At this point let us mention that the classical Hardy space $H^1(-\Delta)$ has many equivalent definitions, e.g. in terms of: various maximal functions, singular integrals, square functions, etc. A particulary useful result is the atomic decomposition theorem (see [6], [22]): a function $f \in H^1(-\Delta)$ can be decomposed as $f(x) = \sum_k \lambda_k a_k(x)$, where $\sum_k |\lambda_k| \simeq \|f\|_{H^1(-\Delta)}$ and a_k are classical atoms, that is, there exist balls B_k such that:

$$\operatorname{supp} a_k \subseteq B_k,$$

$$\|a_k\|_\infty \leq |B_k|^{-1},$$

$$\int a(x)dx = 0.$$

In other words atoms satisfy some localization, size, and cancellation conditions.

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 42B30, 42B25, 35J10 (primary), 47D03, 43A85 (secondary).

Key words and phrases. Hardy space, Schrödinger operator, Bessel operator, maximal function, atomic decomposition.

The second author was supported by Polish funds for sciences grant DEC-2012/05/B/ST1/00672 from Narodowe Centrum Nauki.

Let us mention that Hofmann et al. [21] have found general results (for $\mathcal{V}$ satisfying $0 \leq \mathcal{V} \in L^1_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^d)$) saying that $H^1(\mathcal{L})$ given above is equal to the Hardy spaces via: square functions, atomic or molecular decompositions. However, atoms used in [21] are given in terms of $\mathcal{L}$, to be more precise: a function $a \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ is an atom if there exist a ball B and $b \in \mathrm{Dom}(\mathcal{L})$, such that: $a = \mathcal{L}b$, $\mathrm{supp}\, b \subseteq B$ and $b, \mathcal{L}b$ satisfy some size condition.

An another approach, started by Dziubański and Zienkiewicz in the 90's, was to find atomic spaces with simple geometric conditions that characterize $H^1(\mathcal{L})$. It appeared that this cannot be done in full generality, and the properties of atoms depend strictly on the potential V and the dimension d. For example, if $\mathcal{V} \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and $\mathcal{V} \not\equiv 0$ then atoms have modified cancellation condition $\int a(x)\omega(x)\,dx = 0$, where ω is such that $0 < C^{-1} \leq \omega(x) \leq C$. For this result and generalizations see [15], [17], [24]. Other results, see [14], lead to Hardy spaces with local atoms. It was first observed by Goldberg [19] that if we take supremum for $0 < t \leq \tau^2$ in (1.1), then one obtains atomic space with classical atoms complemented with the atoms of the form $|B|^{-1}\mathbb{1}_B(x)$, where the ball B has radius τ. In [14] the authors assume that for $0 \leq \mathcal{V} \in L^1_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ there exists a family of cubes $\mathcal{Q} = \{Q_k \,:\, k \in \mathbb{N}\}$ such that

$$\overline{\cup_k Q_k} = \mathbb{R}^d, \quad |Q_k \cap Q_j| = 0 \text{ for } k \neq j, \quad d(Q_k) \simeq d(Q_j) \text{ if } Q_k^{***} \cap Q_j^{***} \neq \emptyset.$$

Here $d(Q)$ is the diameter of Q and Q^* is a cube that has the same center as Q but with slightly enlarged diameter. The atomic space $H^1_{at}(\mathcal{Q})$ is built on classical atoms and atoms of the form $|Q_k|^{-1}\mathbb{1}_{Q_k}(x)$. The main result of [14] states that under two additional assumptions on $V, \mathcal{Q}, \mathcal{K}_t$ (see [14, p.41], conditions: (D), (K)) we have that $H^1(\mathcal{L}) = H^1_{at}(\mathcal{Q})$, see [14, Thm. 2.2]. In other words the atoms for $H^1(\mathcal{L})$ are either classical atoms or local atoms related to some $Q_k \in \mathcal{Q}$.

Among examples of atoms for which one can find a family $\mathcal{Q}$ such that the assumptions of [14, Thm. 2.2] are satisfied, there are potentials $\mathcal{V}$ in the Reverse Hölder class in dimension $d \geq 3$. For more examples see [14]. Later, Czaja and Zienkiewicz [7, Thm. 2.4] proved that in dimension one for any $0 \leq \mathcal{V} \in L^1_{loc}(\mathbb{R})$ there is a family of intervals such that [14, Thm. 2.2] gives local atomic decompositions for $H^1(\mathcal{L})$.

A question that we are concerned with is: what happens if we replace $-\Delta$ by the Bessel operator $\mathbf{B}f(x) = -f''(x) - \alpha/x\, f'(x)$ on $L^2((0,\infty), x^\alpha\,dx)$? It is known that if $\alpha + 1 \in \mathbb{N}$ then $\mathbf{B}$ corresponds to $-\Delta$ on radial functions on $\mathbb{R}^d$ with $d = \alpha + 1$, however $\mathbf{B}$ exists and generates a semigroup for all $\alpha > -1$, which can be considered as the Laplace operator on spaces with non-integer dimensions.

In this paper we prove results similar to [14] and [7] for the Bessel operator with a potential.

1.2. **Definitions.** For $\alpha > 0$ let (X, ρ, μ) be a metric-measure space, where $X = (0,\infty)$, $\rho(x,y) = |x-y|$ and $d\mu(x) = x^\alpha\,dx$. Denote $B(x,r) = \{y \in X \,:\, \rho(x,y) < r\}$ and observe that X is a space of homogeneous type in the sense of Coifman-Weiss [6], i.e. the doubling condition holds

$$\mu(B(x,2r)) \leq C\mu(B(x,r)),$$

where C does not depend on $x \in X$ and $r > 0$.

The classical Bessel operator is given by

$$\mathbf{B}f(x) = -f''(x) - \frac{\alpha}{x}f'(x).$$

Slightly abusing notation, we shall also write $\mathbf{B}$ for the densely defined, self-adjoint operator on $L^2(X,\mu)$ that corresponds to the differential operator above, see Subsection 2.1 for the semigroup generated by $\mathbf{B}$.

In this paper we consider the Bessel-Schrödinger operator $\mathbf{L}$,

$$\mathbf{L}f = \mathbf{B}f + V \cdot f, \tag{1.2}$$

where $V \in L^1_{loc}(X,\mu)$, $V \geq 0$. To be more precise, denote $\langle f, g\rangle_\mu = \int fg\,d\mu$ and define a quadratic form

$$Q(f,g) = \langle f', g'\rangle_\mu + \langle \sqrt{V}f, \sqrt{V}g\rangle_\mu,$$

with the domain

$$\mathrm{Dom}(Q) = \left\{ f \in L^2(X,\mu) : f', \sqrt{V}f \in L^2(X,\mu) \right\}.$$

The quadratic form Q is positive and closed. Therefore, it defines a self-adjoint operator $\mathbf{L}$ with the domain

$$\mathrm{Dom}(\mathbf{L}) = \left\{ f \in \mathrm{Dom}(Q) : \exists h \in L^2(X,\mu)\ \forall g \in \mathrm{Dom}(Q) \quad Q(f,g) = \langle h, g\rangle_\mu \right\}.$$

For f, h as above we put $\mathbf{L}f := h$. Let $K_t = \exp(-t\mathbf{L})$ be the semigroup generated by $\mathbf{L}$. Denote by B_s the Bessel process on (X,μ). By using the Feynman-Kac formula,

$$K_t f(x) = E^x \left(\exp\left(-\int_0^t V(B_s)\, ds \right) f(B_t) \right),$$

one gets that K_t has an integral kernel $K_t(x,y)$ and

$$0 \le K_t(x,y) \le P_t(x,y), \tag{1.3}$$

where $P_t(x,y)$ is the kernel related to $P_t = \exp(-t\mathbf{B})$, see Subsection 2.1.

We define the Hardy space $\mathcal{H}^1(\mathbf{L})$ by means of the maximal operator associated with K_t, namely

$$\mathcal{H}^1(\mathbf{L}) = \left\{ f \in L^1(X,\,\mu) : \|f\|_{\mathcal{H}^1(\mathbf{L})} = \left\| \sup_{t>0} |K_t f| \right\|_{L^1(X,\,\mu)} < \infty \right\}. \tag{1.4}$$

The goal of this paper is to give an atomic characterizations of local type for $\mathcal{H}^1(\mathbf{L})$. Let $|I|$ be the diameter of I.

Definition 1.5. *Let $\mathcal{I}$ be a collection of intervals that are closed with respect to the topology on $(0,\infty)$. We call a family $\mathcal{I}$ a proper section of X if:*

(a) for $I, J \in \mathcal{I}$, $I \neq J$, the intersection $I \cap J$ is either the empty set or a singleton,
(b) $X = \bigcup_{I\in\mathcal{I}} I$,
(c) there exists a constant $C_0 > 0$ such that for $I, J \in \mathcal{I}$, $I \cap J \neq \emptyset$ we have

$$C_0^{-1}|I| \le |J| \le C_0|I|.$$

Denote $\tau B(c,r) := B(c,\tau r)$. For an interval $I = B(x,r)$ (if $I = (0,2A)$ we take $I = B(A,A)$), let $cI := B(x,cr)$. For a family $\mathcal{I}$ as in Definition 1.5 we set $I^* := \beta I$ for some fixed $\beta > 1$, such that $I^{***} \cap J^{***} \neq \emptyset$ if and only if $I \cap J \neq \emptyset$.

We say that a function $a : X \to \mathbb{C}$ is an $(\mathcal{I},\mu)$-*atom* if:

(i) there exist $I \in \mathcal{I}$ and an interval $J \subset I^{**}$, such that: $\mathrm{supp}(a) \subset J, \|a\|_\infty \le \mu(J)^{-1}, \int a\, d\mu = 0,$

or

(ii) there exists $I \in \mathcal{I}$, such that $a(x) = \mu(I)^{-1}\mathbb{1}_I(x)$.

The atoms as in (ii) are called local atoms.

The atomic Hardy space $\mathcal{H}^1_{at}(\mathcal{I},\mu)$ associated with the collection $\mathcal{I}$ is defined in the following way. We say that $f \in \mathcal{H}^1_{at}(\mathcal{I},\mu)$ if

$$f(x) = \sum_n \lambda_n a_n(x), \tag{1.6}$$

where $\lambda_n \in \mathbb{C}$, a_n are $(\mathcal{I},\mu)$-atoms, and $\sum_n |\lambda_n| < \infty$. Set

$$\|f\|_{\mathcal{H}^1_{at}(\mathcal{I},\mu)} := \inf \sum_n |\lambda_n|, \tag{1.7}$$

where the infimum is taken over all possible representations of f as in (1.6).

For a collection $\mathcal{I}$ as above and $V \ge 0$, $V \in L^1_{loc}(X,\mu)$ we consider the following two conditions:
- there exist constans $C, \varepsilon > 0$ such that

$$\sup_{y\in I^{**}} \int_X K_{2^k|I|^2}(x,y)\, d\mu(x) \le Ck^{-1-\varepsilon} \qquad \text{for } I \in \mathcal{I},\ k \in \mathbb{N}, \tag{D}$$

- there exist constans $C, \delta > 0$ such that

$$\int_0^{2t}\int_X P_s(x,y)\mathbb{1}_{I^{***}}(y)V(y)\, d\mu(y)\, ds \le C\left(\frac{t}{|I|^2}\right)^\delta \quad \text{for } x \in X,\ I \in \mathcal{I},\ t \le |I|^2. \tag{K}$$

1.3. **Statement of results.** Our first main result is the following, cf. [14, Thm. 2.2]

Theorem 1.8. *Assume that a proper section $\mathcal{I}$ and $0 \leq V \in L^1_{loc}(X,\mu)$ are given, so that (D) and (K) hold. Then $\mathcal{H}^1(\mathbf{L}) = \mathcal{H}^1_{at}(\mathcal{I},\mu)$ and there exists a constant $C>0$, such that*

$$C^{-1}\left\|f\right\|_{\mathcal{H}^1_{at}(\mathcal{I},\mu)} \leq \left\|f\right\|_{\mathcal{H}^1(\mathbf{L})} \leq C\left\|f\right\|_{\mathcal{H}^1_{at}(\mathcal{I},\mu)}.$$

In the second part we give an important application of Theorem 1.8. Let us restrict ourselves to $\alpha \in (0,1)$. We prove that for **any** $0 \leq V \in L^1_{loc}(X,\mu)$ we can find a family $\mathcal{I}(V)$ such that the assumptions of Theorem 1.8 hold, cf. [7, Thm. 2.4] for the case $\alpha = 0$. To be more precise, let $\mathcal{D}$ be a family of dyadic intervals on $(0,\infty)$, that is $\mathcal{D} = \{[k2^n,(k+1)2^n] : k \in \mathbb{N}\cup\{0\}, n \in \mathbb{Z}\}$. Consider the family $\mathcal{I}(V)$ that consists of maximal dyadic closed intervals I that satisfy

$$\frac{|2I|^2}{\mu(2I)}\int_{2I} V(y)\,d\mu(y) \leq 1. \tag{S}$$

In Section 4 we prove that $\mathcal{I}(V)$ is a well defined proper section. The second main result is the following.

Theorem 1.9. *Let $\alpha \in (0,1)$ and $0 \leq V \in L^1_{loc}(X,\mu)$. Then the family $\mathcal{I}(V)$ satisfies the assumptions of Theorem 1.8.*

Corollary 1.10. *Let $\alpha \in (0,1)$ and $0 \leq V \in L^1_{loc}(X,\mu)$. Then there is $C>0$, such that*

$$C^{-1}\left\|f\right\|_{\mathcal{H}^1_{at}(\mathcal{I}(V),\mu)} \leq \left\|f\right\|_{\mathcal{H}^1(\mathbf{L})} \leq C\left\|f\right\|_{\mathcal{H}^1_{at}(\mathcal{I}(V),\mu)}.$$

The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 we study the atomic Hardy spaces related to $\mathbf{B}$ and its local versions. This is used in a proof of Theorem 1.8, which is provided in Section 3. Finally, in Section 4 a proof of Theorem 1.9 is given.

2. Hardy spaces for the Bessel operator

2.1. **Global Hardy space for B.** In this section we consider the case $\alpha > 0$. Let $P_t = \exp(-t\mathbf{B})$ be the Bessel semigroup given by

$$P_t f(x) = \int_X P_t(x,y) f(y)\,d\mu(y),$$
$$P_t(x,y) = (2t)^{-1}\exp\left(-\frac{x^2+y^2}{4t}\right) I_{\frac{\alpha-1}{2}}\left(\frac{xy}{2t}\right)(xy)^{-\frac{\alpha-1}{2}},$$

where $I_\alpha(x) = \sum_{m=0}^\infty \frac{1}{m!\Gamma(m+\alpha+1)}\left(\frac{x}{2}\right)^{2m+\alpha}$ is the modified Bessel function of the first kind. It is clear that $P_t(x,y) = P_t(y,x)$ and, since $\mathbf{B}\mathbb{1}_{(0,\infty)}(x) = 0$, we have that

$$\int_X P_t(x,y)\,d\mu(x) = 1. \tag{2.1}$$

Let us recall that

$$\mu(B(x,t)) \simeq t(x+t)^\alpha. \tag{2.2}$$

It is known that the kernel $P_t(x,y)$ satisfies the two-side Gaussian estimates (see, e.g. [13, Lem. 4.2]),

$$C^{-1}\mu(B(x,\sqrt{t}))^{-1}\exp\left(-\frac{|x-y|^2}{c_1 t}\right) \leq P_t(x,y) \leq C\mu(B(x,\sqrt{t}))^{-1}\exp\left(-\frac{|x-y|^2}{c_2 t}\right), \tag{2.3}$$

while the derivative satisfies

$$\left|\frac{\partial}{\partial x}P_t(x,y)\right| \leq Ct^{-1/2}\mu(B(x,\sqrt{t}))^{-1}\exp\left(-\frac{|x-y|^2}{ct}\right). \tag{2.4}$$

Let $H^1(\mathbf{B})$ be the Hardy space related to P_t, i.e. the space defined as in (1.4) with $\mathbf{L}$ and K_t replaced by $\mathbf{B}$ and P_t, respectively. We call a function a an *μ-atom* if

$$(iii)\ \text{there exists an interval } J \subseteq X,\ \text{such that: } \operatorname{supp}(a) \subset J,\ \left\|a\right\|_\infty \leq \mu(J)^{-1},\ \int a\,d\mu = 0.$$

The atomic Hardy space $H^1_{at}(\mu)$ is defined as in (1.6) and (1.7) with a_n being μ-atoms.

Theorem 2.5. *[4, Thm. 1.7] Let $\alpha > 0$. There is $C > 0$ such that*

$$C^{-1} \|f\|_{H^1_{at}(\mu)} \leq \|f\|_{H^1(\mathbf{B})} \leq C \|f\|_{H^1_{at}(\mu)}.$$

2.2. **Local Hardy space for B.** For $\tau > 0$ we define $h^1_\tau(\mathbf{B})$, *the local Hardy space related to* $\mathbf{B}$, as the set of $L^1(X,\mu)$ functions for which the norm

$$\|f\|_{h^1_\tau(\mathbf{B})} = \left\| \sup_{t \leq \tau^2} |P_t f| \right\|_{L^1(X,\mu)}$$

is finite.

Let $\mathcal{I}_\tau$ be a proper section of X that consists of closed intervals of length τ.

Theorem 2.6. *(a) There exists $C > 0$ such that for $\tau > 0$ and an $(\mathcal{I}_\tau, \mu)$-atom a we have*

$$\|a\|_{h^1_\tau(\mathbf{B})} \leq C.$$

(b) Let I be an interval such that $\operatorname{supp}(f) \subset I^*$ and $f \in h^1_{|I|}(\mathbf{B})$. Then

$$f = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \lambda_n a_n, \quad \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} |\lambda_n| \leq C \|f\|_{h^1_{|I|}(\mathbf{B})},$$

where $a_0(x) = \mu(I)^{-1} \mathbb{1}_I(x)$ and a_n are μ-atoms supported in I^{**} for $n \geq 1$.

Let us remark that another characterization of $h^1_\tau(\mathbf{B})$, by mean of a local Riesz transform, was given in [23, Thm. 2.11]. Theorem 2.6 will be used to prove Theorem 1.8.

Proof. *(a)* Obviously, if a is μ-atom, then the statement follows from Theorem 2.5. Assume then that $a(x) = \mu(I)^{-1} \mathbb{1}_I(x)$ and $|I| = \tau$. It is well known that (2.3) implies the boundedness of the maximal operator $\sup_{t>0} |P_t f|$ on $L^2(X,\mu)$. Using this fact and the Schwarz inequality,

$$\left\| \sup_{t \leq \tau^2} |P_t a| \right\|_{L^1(I^{**},\mu)} \leq C\mu(I)^{1/2} \left\| \sup_{t>0} |P_t a| \right\|_{L^2(X,\mu)} \leq C\mu(I)^{1/2} \|a\|_{L^2(X,\mu)} \leq C.$$

Denote by c_I the center of I and notice that $|x-y| \simeq |x - c_I|$ when $y \in I$ and $x \in (I^{**})^c$. By (2.3),

$$\begin{aligned}
\left\| \sup_{t \leq \tau^2} |P_t a| \right\|_{L^1((I^{**})^c,\mu)} &\leq C \int_{(I^{**})^c} \sup_{t \leq \tau^2} \int_I \mu(B(x,\sqrt{t}))^{-1} \exp\left(-\frac{|x-c_I|^2}{c_3 t} \right) \mu(I)^{-1} \, d\mu(y) \, d\mu(x) \\
&\leq C \int_{(I^{**})^c} \sup_{t \leq \tau^2} t^{-1/2} \exp\left(-\frac{|x-c_I|^2}{c_3 t} \right) dx \\
&\leq C \int_{(I^{**})^c} |I|^{-1} \exp\left(-\frac{|x-c_I|^2}{c_4 |I|^2} \right) dx \leq C.
\end{aligned}$$

(b) Define $\lambda_0 := \int f d\mu$ and $g(x) = f(x) - \lambda_0 \mu(I)^{-1} \mathbb{1}_I(x)$. Notice that

$$|\lambda_0| \leq \|f\|_{L^1(X,\mu)} \leq \|f\|_{h^1_{|I|}(\mathbf{B})}.$$

Therefeore, $\|g\|_{L^1(X,\mu)} \leq 2 \|f\|_{L^1(X,\mu)}$. Our goal is to prove that

$$\|g\|_{H^1(\mathbf{B})} \leq C \|f\|_{h^1_{|I|}(\mathbf{B})}. \tag{2.7}$$

For $t \leq |I|^2$ using (a) we obtain

$$\left\| \sup_{t \leq |I|^2} |P_t g| \right\|_{L^1(X,\mu)} \leq \|f\|_{h^1_{|I|}(\mathbf{B})} + |\lambda_0| \left\| \mu(I)^{-1} \mathbb{1}_I \right\|_{h^1_{|I|}(\mathbf{B})} \leq C \|f\|_{h^1_{|I|}(\mathbf{B})}$$

As for $t \geq |I|^2$ notice that $\int g d\mu = 0$. Therefore, using (2.4),

$$\begin{aligned}
\left\| \sup_{t\geq |I|^2} |P_t g| \right\|_{L^1((I^{**})^c,\mu)} &\leq \int_{(I^{**})^c} \sup_{t\geq |I|^2} \left| \int_{I^*} \left(P_t(x,y) - P_t(x,c_I)\right) g(y)\, d\mu(y) \right| d\mu(x) \\
&\leq \int_{(I^{**})^c} \int_{I^*} \sup_{t\geq |I|^2} \frac{|y-c_I|}{\sqrt{t}} \mu(B(x,\sqrt{t}))^{-1} \exp\left(-\frac{|x-c_I|^2}{c_2 t}\right) |g(y)|\, d\mu(y)\, d\mu(x) \\
&\leq C \|g\|_{L^1(X,\mu)} |I| \int_{(I^{**})^c} \sup_{t\geq |I|^2} t^{-1} \exp\left(-\frac{|x-c_I|^2}{c_2 t}\right) dx \\
&\leq C \|f\|_{L^1(X,\mu)} |I| \int_{(I^{**})^c} |x-c_I|^{-2}\, dx \leq C \|f\|_{h^1_{|I|}(\mathbf{B})}\,.
\end{aligned}$$

Likewise,

$$\begin{aligned}
\left\| \sup_{t\geq |I|^2} |P_t g| \right\|_{L^1(I^{**},\mu)} &\leq C \int_{I^{**}} \int_{I^*} \sup_{t\geq |I|^2} \mu(B(x,\sqrt{t}))^{-1} |g(y)|\, d\mu(y)\, d\mu(x) \\
&\leq C \|g\|_{L^1(X,\mu)} \int_{I^{**}} \sup_{t\geq |I|^2} t^{-1/2}\, dx \leq C \|f\|_{h^1_{|I|}(\mathbf{B})}\,.
\end{aligned}$$

From (2.7) we have that $g \in H^1(\mathbf{B})$, so using Theorem 2.5 we obtain λ_k and μ-atoms a_k such that $g = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \lambda_k a_k$. Consequently,

$$f = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \lambda_k a_k, \qquad \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} |\lambda_k| \leq C \|f\|_{h^1_{|I|}(\mathbf{B})}\,,$$

where $a_0(x) = \mu(I)^{-1} \mathbb{1}_I(x)$.

The only problem we have to deal with is that a_k are not necessarily supported in I^{**}. Let ψ be a function such that $\psi \equiv 1$ on I^*, $\psi \equiv 0$ on $(I^{**})^c$, and $\|\psi'\|_\infty \leq C|I|^{-1}$. To complete the proof we will show, that for every μ-atom a_k there exist a sequence a_k^j, such that each a_k^j is either μ-atom or $a_k^j = \mu(I)^{-1}\mathbb{1}_I$. Moreover, $a_k = \sum_j \lambda_k^j a_k^j$ and $\sum_j |\lambda_k^j| < C$, with C that not depend on k. Fix $a = a_k$ and an interval $J \subseteq X$ such that: $\operatorname{supp}(a) \subset J$, $\|a\|_\infty \leq \mu(J)^{-1}$. Obviously $\operatorname{supp}(\psi a) \subseteq I^{**} \cap J$, and if $J \subset I^*$, then $\psi a = a$ is an μ-atom. Furthermore, if $J \subset (I^{**})^c$, then $\psi a = 0$, so it suffices to consider the case that $J \cap (I^*)^c \cap I^{**} \neq \emptyset$. Observe that $|J| \leq |I|$ and let $N \in \mathbb{N}$ be such that $1/2^{N+1}|I| \leq |J| \leq 1/2^N |I|$.

Define $\lambda := \int \psi a\, d\mu$ and notice that

$$\begin{aligned}
|\lambda| = \left| \int_J \psi(x) a(x)\, d\mu(x) \right| &= \left| \int_J a(x)(\psi(x) - \psi(c_J))\, d\mu(x) \right| \\
&\leq \mu(J)^{-1} \int_J |x-c_J| |\psi'(\xi)|\, d\mu(x) \\
&\leq C|J||I|^{-1} \leq C 2^{-N}.
\end{aligned}$$

Let us choose intervals I_j, such that $J =: I_0 \subset I_1 \subset \cdots \subset I_N \subset I^{**}$, where $|I_{j+1}|/|I_j| = 2$ and $|I_N| \simeq |I|$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}
\psi a = \left(\psi a - \lambda \mu(I_0)^{-1} \mathbb{1}_{I_0}\right) + \sum_{j=1}^{N} \lambda \left(\mu(I_{j-1})^{-1} \mathbb{1}_{I_{j-1}} - \mu(I_j)^{-1} \mathbb{1}_{I_j}\right) \\
+ \lambda(\mu(I_N)^{-1} \mathbb{1}_{I_N} - \mu(I)^{-1} \mathbb{1}_I) + \lambda \mu(I)^{-1} \mathbb{1}_I = \sum_{j=0}^{N+2} b_j.
\end{aligned}$$

Observe that:

(1) for $j = 0, ..., N$ we have: $\operatorname{supp}(b_j) \subseteq I_j$, $\int b_j\, d\mu = 0$, and

$$\|b_j\|_\infty \leq C|\lambda| \mu(I_j)^{-1} \leq C 2^{-N} \mu(I_j)^{-1},$$

(2) $\operatorname{supp}(b_{N+1}) \subseteq I^{**}$, $\|b_{N+1}\|_\infty \leq C|\lambda| \mu(I)^{-1}$ and $\int b_{N+1}\, d\mu = 0$.

We conclude that b_j are multiples of $(\mathcal{I}_{|I|},\mu)$-atoms and

$$\left\|\sum_{j=0}^{N+2} b_j\right\|_{H^1_{at}(\mathcal{I}_{|I|},\mu)} \le C\sum_{j=0}^{N+2} 2^{-N} \le C.$$

□

Corollary 2.8. *There exists a constant $C>0$ such that for $\tau>0$ we have*

$$C^{-1}\,\|f\|_{\mathcal{H}^1_{at}(\mathcal{I}_\tau,\mu)} \le \|f\|_{h^1_\tau(\mathbf{B})} \le C\,\|f\|_{\mathcal{H}^1_{at}(\mathcal{I}_\tau,\mu)}\,.$$

The right inequality in Corolarry 2.8 follows easily from Theorem 2.6(a). For the left inequality one uses Theorem 2.6(b) with a suitable partition of unity and methods as in Lemmas 3.2 and 3.5 below. We omit the details.

3. Proof of Theorem 1.8

3.1. **Auxiliary estimates.** For a proper section $\mathcal{I}$ let $\{\phi_I\}_{I\in\mathcal{I}}$ be a partition of unity associated with $\mathcal{I}$, that is a family of C^∞ functions on X, such that $\operatorname{supp}(\phi_I)\subset I^*$, $0\le\phi_I\le 1$, $\|\phi_I'\|_\infty \le |I|^{-1}$ and $\sum_{I\in\mathcal{I}}\phi_I(x)=1$ for all $x\in X$.

The perturbation formula states that

$$P_t(x,y)-K_t(x,y)=\int_0^t\int_X P_{t-s}(x,z)V(z)K_s(z,y)\,d\mu(z)ds. \tag{3.1}$$

To prove Theorem 1.8 we closely follow the proof of [14, Thm. 2.2]. However, in our weighted space, some technical difficulties appear. Therefore we present all the details for convenience of the reader.

Lemma 3.2. *For $I\in\mathcal{I}$ and $f\in L^1(X,\,\mu)$,*

$$\left\|\sup_{t\le 4|I|^2}|P_t(\phi_I f)|\right\|_{L^1((I^{**})^c,\,\mu)} \le C\,\|\phi_I f\|_{L^1(X,\,\mu)}\,.$$

Proof. Denote by c_I the center of the interval $I\in\mathcal{I}$. For $x\in(I^{**})^c$ and $y\in I^*$ we have $|x-y|\simeq|x-c_I|$. Notice that (2.2) implies

$$\mu(B(x,\sqrt{t}))^{-1}x^\alpha \le t^{-1/2}. \tag{3.3}$$

Using (2.3) the left-hand side is bounded by

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_{(I^{**})^c}\sup_{t\le 4|I|^2}\int_{I^*}\mu(B(x,\sqrt{t}))^{-1}e^{-\frac{|x-y|^2}{c_2t}}\,|\phi_I(y)f(y)|\;d\mu(y)\,d\mu(x)\\
&\qquad\le C\,\|\phi_I f\|_{L^1(X,\mu)}\int_{(I^{**})^c}\sup_{t\le 4|I|^2}x^{-\alpha}t^{-\frac12}e^{-\frac{|x-c_I|^2}{c_3t}}\,d\mu(x)\\
&\qquad\le C\,\|\phi_I f\|_{L^1(X,\mu)}\int_{(I^{**})^c}|I|^{-1}e^{-\frac{|x-c_I|^2}{c_4|I|^2}}\,dx\\
&\qquad\le C\,\|\phi_I f\|_{L^1(X,\,\mu)}\,.
\end{aligned}$$

□

Corollary 3.4. *For $I\in\mathcal{I}$ and $f\in L^1(X,\,\mu)$,*

$$\|\phi_I f\|_{h^1_{|I|}(\mathbf{B})} \simeq \left\|\sup_{t\le|I|^2}|P_t(\phi_I f)|\right\|_{L^1(I^{**},\,\mu)}.$$

Denote

$$\widetilde{f}_I:=\sum_{J:I\cap J\neq\emptyset}\phi_J f,\qquad\qquad \bar{f}_I:=f-\widetilde{f}_I=\sum_{J:I\cap J=\emptyset}\phi_J f.$$

Lemma 3.5. *For $I \in \mathcal{I}$ and $f \in L^1(X,\,\mu)$,*

$$\left\| \sup_{t\le |I|^2} \left| K_t\left(\phi_I \widetilde{f}_I\right) - \phi_I K_t\left(\widetilde{f}_I\right)\right| \right\|_{L^1(I^{**},\,\mu)} \le C \sum_{J: I\cap J\neq\emptyset} \|\phi_J f\|_{L^1(X,\,\mu)}$$

Proof. Denote $\widetilde{I} = \cup_{J: I\cap J\neq\emptyset} J^*$. Note that for $x \in I^{**}$ and $y \in \widetilde{I}$, there is $|x-y| \le C|I|$ and

$$\sup_{t\le |I|^2} t^{-\frac{1}{2}}\, e^{-\frac{|x-y|^2}{c_2 t}} \;\le\; C\;|x-y|^{-1}\,. \tag{3.6}$$

Using (1.3), (2.3), (3.3), and (3.6),

$$\begin{aligned}
\left\| \sup_{t\le |I|^2} \left| K_t\left(\phi_I \widetilde{f}_I\right) - \phi_I K_t\left(\widetilde{f}_I\right)\right| \right\|_{L^1(I^{**},\,\mu)} &\le \int_{I^{**}} \sup_{t\le |I|^2} \int_{\widetilde{I}} |\phi_I(y)-\phi_I(x)|\, K_t(x,y) \left|\widetilde{f}_I(y)\right| \, d\mu(y)\, d\mu(x) \\
&\le C \int_{I^{**}} \int_{\widetilde{I}} |x-y|\, \|\phi_I'\|_\infty \sup_{t\le |I|^2} t^{-\frac{1}{2}} e^{-\frac{|x-y|^2}{c_2 t}} \left|\widetilde{f}_I(y)\right| \, d\mu(y)\, dx \\
&\le C \int_{I^{**}} |I|^{-1} dx \left\|\widetilde{f}_I\right\|_{L^1(X,\mu)}\,.
\end{aligned}$$

□

Lemma 3.7. *Assume that V and $\mathcal{I}$ are given, so that (D) holds. Then*

$$\sum_{I\in\mathcal{I}} \left\| \sup_{t>0} \left| K_t\left(\bar{f}_I\right)\right| \right\|_{L^1(I^{***},\,\mu)} \le C\, \|f\|_{L^1(X,\,\mu)}\,.$$

Proof. Denote $s_m = 2^m |I|^2$ and let $m \ge 2$. By the semigroup property, (1.3), (2.3),

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left\| \sup_{s_m\le t\le s_{m+1}} K_t(|\phi_J f|) \right\|_{L^1(X,\,\mu)} \\
&\le \int_X \sup_{s_m\le t\le s_{m+1}} \int_X \int_X P_{t-s_{m-1}}(x,z) K_{s_{m-1}}(z,y)\, |\phi_J(y) f(y)| \, d\mu(z)\, d\mu(y)\, d\mu(x) \\
&\le C \int_X |\phi_J(y) f(y)| \int_X K_{s_{m-1}}(z,y) \int_X s_m^{-1/2} \exp\left(-\frac{|x-z|^2}{c_3 s_m}\right) dx\, d\mu(z)\, d\mu(y) \\
&\le C(m-1)^{-1-\varepsilon} \cdot \|\phi_J f\|_{L^1(X,\,\mu)}\,.
\end{aligned}$$

In the last inequality we have applied (D). Using the above estimate and Lemma 3.2,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{I\in\mathcal{I}} \left\| \sup_{t>0} \left| K_t\left(\sum_{J: I\cap J=\emptyset} \phi_J f\right)\right| \right\|_{L^1(I^{***},\,\mu)} \\
&\le \sum_{J\in\mathcal{I}} \sum_{I: J\cap I=\emptyset} \left\| \sup_{t>0} K_t(|\phi_J f|) \right\|_{L^1(I^{***},\,\mu)} \le C \sum_{J\in\mathcal{I}} \left\| \sup_{t>0} K_t(|\phi_J f|) \right\|_{L^1((J^{**})^c,\,\mu)} \\
&\le C \sum_{J\in\mathcal{I}} \left\| \sup_{t\le 4|J|^2} K_t(|\phi_J f|) \right\|_{L^1((J^{**})^c,\,\mu)} + C \sum_{J\in\mathcal{I}} \sum_{m=2}^{\infty} \left\| \sup_{s_m\le t\le s_{m+1}} K_t(|\phi_J f|) \right\|_{L^1((J^{**})^c,\,\mu)} \\
&\le C \sum_{J\in\mathcal{I}} \|\phi_J f\|_{L^1(X,\,\mu)} + C \sum_{J\in\mathcal{I}} \sum_{m=2}^{\infty} m^{-1-\varepsilon} \cdot \|\phi_J f\|_{L^1(X,\,\mu)} \le C\, \|f\|_{L^1(X,\,\mu)}\,.
\end{aligned}$$

□

Lemma 3.8.

$$\int_0^\infty \int_X V(z) K_s(|f|)(z)\, d\mu(z)\, ds \le C\, \|f\|_{L^1(X,\,\mu)}$$

Proof. By integrating (3.1) and using (2.1) we obtain

$$\int_0^t \int_X V(z) K_s(z,y)\, d\mu(z)\, ds \le C.$$

The proof is finished by setting $t \to \infty$. □

Lemma 3.9. *Assume that V and $\mathcal{I}$ are given, so that (K) holds. Then for $I \in \mathcal{I}$,*

$$\left\| \sup_{t \le |I|^2} |(P_t - K_t)(\phi_I f)| \right\|_{L^1(X,\mu)} \le C \left\| \phi_I f \right\|_{L^1(X,\mu)}.$$

Proof. By (1.3) and Lemma 3.2,

$$\left\| \sup_{t \le |I|^2} |(P_t - K_t)(\phi_I f)| \right\|_{L^1((I^{**})^c,\mu)} \le C \left\| \phi_I f \right\|_{L^1(X,\mu)}.$$

Consider the integral on I^{**}. From (3.1),

$$(P_t - K_t)(\phi_I f)(x) = \int_0^t P_{t-s} V'' K_s(\phi_I f)(x)\, ds + \int_0^t P_{t-s} V' K_s(\phi_I f)(x)\, ds$$

where $V = \mathbb{1}_{I^{***}} V + \mathbb{1}_{(I^{***})^c} V = V' + V''$. Repeating the argument from the proof of Lemma 3.2 and using Lemma 3.8 we obtain

$$\left\| \sup_{t \le |I|^2} \int_0^t P_{t-s} V'' K_s(\phi_I f)\, ds \right\|_{L^1(I^{**}_{,}\mu)} \le C \left\| \phi_I f \right\|_{L^1(X,\mu)}.$$

To estimate the integral that contains V' write

$$\left| \int_0^t P_{t-s} V' K_s(\phi_j f))(x)\, ds \right| \le \int_0^{t/2} P_{t-s} V' P_s(|\phi_j f|)(x)\, ds + \int_{t/2}^t P_{t-s} V' P_s(|\phi_j f|)(x)\, ds$$

$$= A_{1,t}(x) + A_{2,t}(x).$$

Let $t_m = 2^{-m}|I|^2$. Similarly as in proof of the Lemma 3.7 we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\left\| \sup_{t \le |I|^2} A_{1,t} \right\|_{L^1(X,\mu)} &\le \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \int_X \sup_{t_{m+1} \le t \le t_m} \int_0^{t/2} \int_X P_{t-s}(x,y) V'(y) P_s(|\phi_I f|)(y)\, d\mu(y)\, ds\, d\mu(x) \\
&\le C \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \int_X \int_0^{t_m} V'(y) P_s(|\phi_I f|)(y) \int_X t_m^{-\frac{1}{2}} e^{-\frac{|x-y|^2}{c_3 t_m}}\, dx\, ds\, d\mu(y) \\
&\le C \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \int_0^{t_m} \int_X \mathbb{1}_{I^{***}}(y) V(y) P_s(|\phi_I f|)(y)\, ds\, d\mu(y) \\
&\le C \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \left(\frac{2^{-m}|I|^2}{|I|^2} \right)^{\delta} \left\| \phi_I f \right\|_{L^1(X,\mu)}.
\end{aligned}$$

In the last inequality we have used (K). To estimate $A_{2,t}$ we proceed similarly noticing that for $t \in [t_{m+1}, t_m]$ and $s \in [t/2, t]$ we have $s \in [t_{m+2}, t_m]$. The details are left to the reader. □

3.2. **Proof of Theorem 1.8. First inequality.** Observe that $\phi_I f = \phi_I \widetilde{f}_I$ and

$$K_t(\phi_I f) = K_t\left(\phi_I \widetilde{f}_I\right) - \phi_I K_t\left(\widetilde{f}_I\right) - \phi_I K_t\left(\bar{f}_I\right) + \phi_I K_t(f).$$

From Lemmas 3.5 and 3.7 we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{I\in\mathcal{I}}\left\|\sup_{t\le|I|^2}|K_t(\phi_I f)|\right\|_{L^1(I^{**},\mu)} \le& \sum_{I\in\mathcal{I}}\left\|\sup_{t\le|I|^2}\left|K_t\left(\phi_I\widetilde{f}_I\right)-\phi_I K_t\left(\widetilde{f}_I\right)\right|\right\|_{L^1(I^{**},\mu)}\\ &+\sum_{I\in\mathcal{I}}\left\|\sup_{t\le|I|^2}|\phi_I K_t\left(\bar{f}_I\right)|\right\|_{L^1(I^{**},\mu)}\\ &+\sum_{I\in\mathcal{I}}\left\|\sup_{t\le|I|^2}|\phi_I K_t f|\right\|_{L^1(I^{**},\mu)}\\ \le& C\left(\|f\|_{L^1(X,\mu)}+\|f\|_{\mathcal{H}^1(\mathbf{L})}\right)\le C\,\|f\|_{\mathcal{H}^1(\mathbf{L})}\,.\end{aligned}$$

The above estimate, together with Corollary 3.4 and Lemma 3.9, lead to

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{I\in\mathcal{I}}\|\phi_I f\|_{h^1_{|I|}(\mathbf{B})} &\le C\sum_{I\in\mathcal{I}}\left\|\sup_{t\le|I|^2}|(P_t-K_t)(\phi_I f)|\right\|_{L^1(I^{**},\mu)}+C\sum_{I\in\mathcal{I}}\left\|\sup_{t\le|I|^2}|K_t(\phi_I f)|\right\|_{L^1(I^{**},\mu)}\\ &\le C\,\|f\|_{\mathcal{H}^1(\mathbf{L})}\,.\end{aligned}$$

Now we use Theorem 2.6(b) for each $\phi_I f$ getting $(\lambda_n^I)_n$ and $(\mathcal{I},\mu)$-atoms $(a_n^I)_n$, so that

$$\phi_I f(x)=\sum_n \lambda_n^I a_n^I(x),\quad\text{and}\quad\sum_n|\lambda_n^I|\le C\,\|\phi_I f\|_{h^1_{|I|}(\mathbf{B})}\,.$$

Summing up for all $I\in\mathcal{I}$ we finish the first part of the proof.

Second inequality. Let a be an $(\mathcal{I},\mu)$-*atom*, such that $\operatorname{supp}(a)\subset I^{**}$. There exists an integer $m\ge 0$, independent of I, such that

$$\inf\left\{|I|^2: J\cap I\neq\emptyset\right\}\ge 2^{-m}|I|^2.$$

Denote $t_n=2^{-n}|I|^2$. Observe that

$$\left\|\sup_{t\le t_m}|K_t(a)|\right\|_{L^1(X,\mu)}\le\left\|\sup_{t\le t_m}|(K_t-P_t)(a)|\right\|_{L^1(X,\mu)}+\left\|\sup_{t\le t_m}|P_t(a)|\right\|_{L^1(X,\mu)}\le\|a\|_{L^1(X,\mu)}\,.$$

In the last inequality we applied Lemma 3.9 and Theorem 2.6(b), since a is also an $(\mathcal{I}_{|I|},\mu)$-*atom*.

It suffices to estimate $\left\|\sup_{t>t_m}|K_t a|\right\|_{L^1(X,\mu)}$. This is done by using (1.3) and (K). Indeed, using similar methods as in the proof of Lemma 3.2,

$$\begin{aligned}\left\|\sup_{t>t_m}|K_t a|\right\|_{L^1(X,\mu)} &\le\sum_{n\le m}\left\|\sup_{t_n\le t\le t_{n-1}}|K_t a|\right\|_{L^1(X,\mu)}\\ &\le\sum_{n\le m}\left\|\sup_{t_{n+1}\le t\le 3t_{n+1}}K_t\left|K_{t_{n+1}}a\right|\right\|_{L^1(X,\mu)}\\ &\le C\sum_{n\le m+1}\int_X\int_X K_{2^{-n}|I|^2}(x,y)\,|a(y)|\,d\mu(y)\,d\mu(x)\\ &\le C\,\|a\|_{L^1(X,\mu)}\le C,\end{aligned}$$

since the operator $\sup_{t_{n+1}\le t\le 3t_{n+1}}K_t$ is bounded on $L^1(X,\mu)$, see (2.3).

4. Proof of Theorem 1.9.

In the whole section we assume that $\alpha\in(0,1)$. Recall that for $0\le a<b$,

$$\mu((a,b))=\frac{b^{1+\alpha}-a^{1+\alpha}}{1+\alpha}\simeq\begin{cases}b^{\alpha+1} & 2a\le b\\ (b-a)a^\alpha & 2a\ge b.\end{cases}\tag{4.1}$$

By (4.1) and the Mean-Value Theorem we easily get

$$\frac{|I|^2}{\mu(I)} \simeq b^{1-\alpha} - a^{1-\alpha}. \tag{4.2}$$

Lemma 4.3. *For $\alpha \in (0,1)$ and $I \subset J \subset (0,\infty)$,*

$$\frac{|I|^2}{\mu(I)} \int_I V(y)\, d\mu(y) \leq \frac{|J|^2}{\mu(J)} \int_J V(y)\, d\mu(y).$$

Proof. Obviously, since $V \geq 0$, it is enough to prove that

$$\frac{|I|^2}{\mu(I)} \leq \frac{|J|^2}{\mu(J)}. \tag{4.4}$$

Let $a \leq b \leq c \leq d$ and $I = (b,c) \subset (a,d) = J$. Denote $\Gamma(x,y) = (y-x)^2/(y^{\alpha+1} - x^{\alpha+1})$. Now, (4.4) is equivalent to $\Gamma(b,c) \leq \Gamma(a,d)$. This is done in two steps.

Step 1: $\Gamma(b,c) \leq \Gamma(a,c)$. Denote $a = sc$ and $b = tc$, where $0 < s \leq t < 1$. It is enough to prove

$$\frac{(1-t)^2}{1-t^{\alpha+1}} \leq \frac{(1-s)^2}{1-s^{\alpha+1}}.$$

By a simple calculus argument, the function $F_1(x) = (1-x)^2/(1-x^{\alpha+1})$ is monotonically decreasing for $x \in (0,1)$.

Step 2: $\Gamma(a,c) \leq \Gamma(a,d)$. Similarly, let $c = t'a$, $d = s'a$, $1 < t' \leq s'$. The function $F_2(x) = (x-1)^2/(x^{\alpha+1} - 1)$ is monotonically increasing in $(1,\infty)$, thus

$$\frac{(t'-1)^2}{(t')^{\alpha+1} - 1} \leq \frac{(s'-1)^2}{(s')^{\alpha+1} - 1}.$$

□

Proposition 4.5. *Let $V \in L^1_{loc}(X,\mu)$, $V \geq 0$. Then the family $\mathcal{I}(V)$ of maximal dyadic intervals satisfying (S) is a well-defined proper section (see Definition 1.5).*

Proof. For a closed dyadic interval I consider $F(I) = |2I|^2 \mu(2I)^{-1} \int_{2I} V d\mu$ and denote by I^d the smallest dyadic interval containing I. Notice that $2I \subseteq 2I^d$ and, by Lemma 4.3, we have $F(I) \leq F(I^d)$. Also, for an increasing sequence of dyadic intervals $I_n \subset I_{n+1}$ we have $\lim_{n\to\infty} F(I_n) = \infty$, see (4.2).

This justifies the choice of $\mathcal{I}(V)$ as maximal dyadic intervals such that (S) holds. What is left to prove is that $\mathcal{I}(V)$ is a proper section, namely we need to show that for $I, J \in \mathcal{I}(V)$, $I \cap J \neq \emptyset$ we have $|I| \simeq |J|$.

By contradiction, suppose that there exist I_k, J_k such that $I_k \cap J_k \neq \emptyset$ and $|I_k|/|J_k| \to \infty$. We can assume that $2J_k^d \subseteq 2I_k$ for all k. Denote, $a_k = |I_k|^2 \mu(I_k)^{-1} |J_k|^{-2} \mu(J_k)$. By the choice of $\mathcal{I}$,

$$1 \geq \frac{|2I_k|^2}{\mu(2I_k)} \int_{2I_k} V(y)\, d\mu(y) \geq \frac{|2I_k|^2}{\mu(2I_k)} \frac{\mu(2J_k^d)}{|2J_k^d|^2} \int_{2J_k^d} V(y)\, d\mu(y) \geq C^{-1} a_k.$$

The proof will be finished when we show that $a_k \to \infty$. This follows from (4.1) by considering several cases. Let a, b, c be such that $0 \leq a < b < c$.

Case 1: $J_k = [a,b]$, $I_k = [b,c]$.
Subcase 1: $4a \leq 2b \leq c$. Using (4.1) we have

$$a_k \simeq (c/b)^2 (b/c)^{1+\alpha} = (c/b)^{1-\alpha} \simeq (|I_k|/|J_k|)^{1-\alpha}.$$

Subcase 2: $4a \leq 2b \geq c$. This subcase can hold only for finite k.
Subcase 3: $4a \geq 2b \leq c$. Using (4.1) we have

$$a_k \simeq \frac{c^2}{(b-a)^2} \frac{(b-a)a^\alpha}{c^{\alpha+1}} = \frac{a^\alpha c}{c^\alpha (b-a)} \geq \frac{c^{1-\alpha}}{(b-a)^{1-\alpha}} \simeq (|I_k|/|J_k|)^{1-\alpha}.$$

Subcase 4: $4a \geq 2b \geq c$. Using (4.1) we have

$$a_k \simeq \left(\frac{c-b}{b-a}\right)^2 \frac{(b-a)a^\alpha}{(c-b)b^\alpha} \simeq |I_k|/|J_k|.$$

Case 2: $J_k = [b,c]$, $I_k = [a,b]$. Then

$$a_k \geq C\left(\frac{|I_k|}{|J_k|}\right)^2 \frac{|J_k|b^\alpha}{|I_k|b^\alpha} \simeq |I_k|/|J_k|.$$

□

Recall that $\langle f, g\rangle_\mu = \int_X fg\, d\mu$, so that $\langle -\mathbf{B}\phi, \psi\rangle_\mu = \langle \phi, -\mathbf{B}\psi\rangle_\mu$ for appropriate ψ, ϕ. For $y > 0$ the distributional equation

$$-\mathbf{B}\phi = \delta_y$$

has the solution given by $\phi_y(x) = \frac{1}{2(1-\alpha)}\left|x^{1-\alpha} - y^{1-\alpha}\right|$. We shall use ϕ_y to construct superharmonic functions that will be crucial in the proof of (D).

Lemma 4.6. *Let $\alpha \in (0,1)$, $0 \leq V \in L^1_{loc}(X,\mu)$, and $\mathcal{I}(V)$ is as in Proposition 4.5. Then*

$$\int_X K_{2^n|I|^2}(x,y)\, d\mu(x) \leq C 2^{-\frac{1-\alpha}{2}n}$$

for $y \in I^{**}$, $I \in \mathcal{I}(V)$, and $n \geq 0$.

Proof. Let I be a dyadic interval such that

$$\frac{|2I|^2}{\mu(2I)}\int_{2I} V d\mu \leq 1, \qquad \frac{|2I^d|^2}{\mu(2I^d)}\int_{2I^d} V d\mu > 1.$$

By continuity argument there exists J such that $I^{**} \subset 2I \subset J \subset 2I^d$ and $\frac{|J|^2}{\mu(J)}\int_J V\, d\mu = 1$. Let $J = (a,b)$ and observe that $|J| \simeq |I|$. Define

$$\phi_I(x) = 1 + \frac{1}{2(1-\alpha)}\int_J V(y)\left|x^{1-\alpha} - y^{1-\alpha}\right| d\mu(y).$$

Fix $z \in I^{**}$. By (4.2) and the doubling condition,

$$\phi_I(z) \leq 1 + C \sup_{y,y' \in J} |y^{1-\alpha} - (y')^{1-\alpha}| \int_J V d\mu \simeq C. \tag{4.7}$$

Also, we claim that for $x \in X$,

$$\phi_I(x) \simeq 1 + \frac{\mu(J)\left|x^{1-\alpha} - z^{1-\alpha}\right|}{|J|^2}. \tag{4.8}$$

Indeed, if x is such that $|x^{1-\alpha} - z^{1-\alpha}| \leq C|J|^2\mu(J)^{-1}$, with C large enough, this follows exactly as in (4.7). In the opposite case $|x^{1-\alpha} - z^{1-\alpha}| \geq C|J|^2\mu(J)^{-1}$, we have $|x^{1-\alpha} - z^{1-\alpha}| \simeq |x^{1-\alpha} - y^{1-\alpha}|$ for $y \in J$ and the claim follows.

Now we proceed to a crucial argument that uses superharmonicity. Observe that formal calculation gives

$$-\mathbf{L}\phi_I(x) = -\mathbf{B}\phi_I(x) - V(x)\phi_I(x) = V(x)(\mathbb{1}_J(x) - \phi_I(x)) \leq 0$$

and, consequently,

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t}K_t\phi_I(z) = \int_X K_t(z,x)(-\mathbf{L}\phi_I(x))\, d\mu(x) \leq 0.$$

This leads to

$$K_t\phi_I(z) \leq \phi_I(z), \qquad t > 0. \tag{4.9}$$

However, ϕ_I is not in $\mathrm{Dom}(\mathbf{L})$ (or even in $L^2(X,\mu)$), thus we provide a detailed proof of (4.9) in Appendix.

Denote

$$\theta(t) = \int_X K_t(z,x)\, d\mu(x).$$

Our goal is prove that

$$\theta(2^n|I|^2) \le c_0 2^{-\frac{1-\alpha}{2}n}. \tag{4.10}$$

This will follow by induction argument. By (1.3) and (2.3),

$$K_{2t}(z,x) = \int_X K_t(z,y)K_t(y,x)\,d\mu(y) \le C\theta(t)\mu(B(x,\sqrt{t}))^{-1} \tag{4.11}$$

and

$$\theta(2t) = \int_{|x^{1-\alpha}-z^{1-\alpha}|<R} K_{2t}(z,x)\,d\mu(x) + \int_{|x^{1-\alpha}-z^{1-\alpha}|>R} K_{2t}(z,x)\,d\mu(x) = A_1 + A_2.$$

By (4.8), (4.9), and (4.7) we have

$$\begin{aligned} A_2 &\le \frac{|J|^2}{R\mu(J)} \int_{|x^{1-\alpha}-z^{1-\alpha}|>R} K_{2t}(z,x) \frac{\mu(J)\,|x^{1-\alpha}-z^{1-\alpha}|}{|J|^2}\,d\mu(x) \\ &\le CR^{-1}|J|^2\mu(J)^{-1} \int K_{2t}(z,x)\phi_I(x)\,d\mu(x) \\ &\le CR^{-1}|J|^2\mu(J)^{-1}. \end{aligned}$$

To estmate A_1 we use (4.11) and (2.2),

$$\begin{aligned} A_1 &\le C\theta(t) \int_{|x^{1-\alpha}-z^{1-\alpha}|<R} \mu(B(x,\sqrt{t}))^{-1}\,d\mu(x) \\ &\le C\theta(t)t^{-1/2} \int_{|x^{1-\alpha}-z^{1-\alpha}|<R} dx. \end{aligned}$$

Case A: $z^{1-\alpha} \ge 2R$, then

$$\int_{|x^{1-\alpha}-z^{1-\alpha}|<R} dx = \frac{1}{1-\alpha}\left((z^{1-\alpha}+R)^{\frac{1}{1-\alpha}} - (z^{1-\alpha}-R)^{\frac{1}{1-\alpha}}\right) \le CRz^{\alpha}.$$

In this case

$$\theta(2t) \le c_1\left(\theta(t)t^{-1/2}Rz^{\alpha} + R^{-1}|J|^2\mu(J)^{-1}\right). \tag{4.12}$$

Case B: $z^{1-\alpha} < 2R$,

$$\int_{|x^{1-\alpha}-z^{1-\alpha}|<R} dx \le C(z^{1-\alpha}+R)^{\frac{1}{1-\alpha}} \le CR^{\frac{1}{1-\alpha}}.$$

In this case

$$\theta(2t) \le c_2\left(\theta(t)t^{-1/2}R^{\frac{1}{1-\alpha}} + R^{-1}|J|^2\mu(J)^{-1}\right). \tag{4.13}$$

Now we proceed to the proof of (4.10). The first step, $\theta(|I|^2) \le C$, follows simply by (1.3). Assume that (4.10) holds for some n. Consider the following cases:

Case 1: $\rho(0,I) \ge 2|I|$. In this case $\mu(I) \simeq |I|z^{\alpha}$.
Subcase 1.1: $\theta(2^n|I|^2) \ge 2^{n/2}|I|^2z^{-2}$. Observe that

$$R_1 := 2^{-1}\theta(2^n|I|^2)^{-1/2}(2^n|I|^2)^{1/4}|I|^{1/2}z^{-\alpha} < z^{1-\alpha}/2.$$

Putting $R = R_1$ and $t = 2^n|I|^2$ into (4.12) and using the induction hypothesis,

$$\begin{aligned} \theta(2^{n+1}|I|^2) &\le c_3\theta(2^n|I|^2)^{1/2}(2^n|I|^2)^{-1/4}|I|^{1/2} \\ &\le c_3c_0^{1/2}2^{-n\frac{1-\alpha}{4}}2^{-\frac{n}{4}} \le c_0 2^{-(n+1)\frac{1-\alpha}{2}}. \end{aligned}$$

The last inequality holds if we choose c_0 such that $c_0 \ge c_3^2 2^{1-\alpha}$.
Subcase 1.2: $\theta(2^n|I|^2) \le 2^{n/2}|I|^2z^{-2}$. One easily checks that

$$R_2 := 2^{-1}\left(\theta(2^n|I|^2)^{-1}(2^n|I|^2)^{1/2}|I|z^{-\alpha}\right)^{\frac{1-\alpha}{2-\alpha}} > z^{1-\alpha}/2.$$

Putting $R = R_2$ and $t = 2^n|I|^2$ into (4.13) and using the induction hypothesis,

$$\begin{aligned}\theta(2^{n+1}|I|^2) &\le c_4\left(\theta(2^n|I|^2)(2^n|I|^2)^{-1/2}|I|^{\frac{1}{1-\alpha}}z^{-\frac{\alpha}{1-\alpha}}\right)^{\frac{1-\alpha}{2-\alpha}}\\ &\le c_4\left(\theta(2^n|I|^2)(2^n|I|^2)^{-1/2}|I|\right)^{\frac{1-\alpha}{2-\alpha}}\\ &\le c_4\left(c_0(2^{-n})^{\frac{1-\alpha}{2}+\frac{1}{2}}\right)^{\frac{1-\alpha}{2-\alpha}} \le c_0 2^{-(n+1)\frac{1-\alpha}{2}}.\end{aligned}$$

In the last inequality we choose c_0 such that $c_0 \ge c_4^{2-\alpha}2^{(1-\alpha)(2-\alpha)/2}$. Notice that we have used $z \ge |I|$, which follows from $\rho(0,I) \ge 2|I|$.

Case 2: $\rho(0,I) \le 2\,|I|$. In this case $\mu(I) \simeq |I|^{\alpha+1}$. Notice that $z \le 4|I|$.
Subcase 2.1 $\theta(2^n|I|^2) \ge 2^{n/2}|I|^{2-\alpha}z^{\alpha-2}$. Observe that

$$R_3 := 2^{-1}\theta(2^n|I|^2)^{-1/2}(2^n|I|^2)^{1/4}|I|^{\frac{1-\alpha}{2}}z^{-\alpha/2} < z^{1-\alpha}/2.$$

Putting $R = R_3$ and $t = 2^n|I|^2$ into (4.12) and using the induction hypothesis,

$$\begin{aligned}\theta(2^{n+1}|I|^2) &\le c_5\theta(2^n|I|^2)^{1/2}2^{-n/4}z^{\alpha/2}|I|^{-\alpha/2}\\ &\le c_5c_0^{1/2}2^{-n\frac{1-\alpha}{4}}2^{-\frac{n}{4}}z^{\alpha/2}|I|^{-\alpha/2}\\ &\le c_5c_0^{1/2}2^{\alpha}2^{-n\frac{1-\alpha}{4}}2^{-\frac{n}{4}}\\ &\le c_0 2^{-(n+1)\frac{1-\alpha}{2}}.\end{aligned}$$

The last inequality holds if we choose c_0 such that $c_0 \ge c_5^2 2^{1+\alpha}$.
Subcase 2.2 $\theta(2^n|I|^2) < 2^{n/2}|I|^{2-\alpha}z^{\alpha-2}$. One easily checks that

$$R_4 := 2^{-1}\left(\theta(2^n|I|^2)^{-1}(2^n|I|^2)^{1/2}|I|^{1-\alpha}\right)^{\frac{1-\alpha}{2-\alpha}} > z^{1-\alpha}/2.$$

Putting R_4 and $t = 2^n|I|^2$ into (4.13) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\theta(2^{n+1}|I|^2) &\le c_6\left(\theta(2^n|I|^2)(2^n|I|^2)^{-1/2}|I|\right)^{\frac{1-\alpha}{2-\alpha}}\\ &\le c_6\left(c_0(2^{-n})^{\frac{1-\alpha}{2}+\frac{1}{2}}\right)^{\frac{1-\alpha}{2-\alpha}} \le c_0 2^{-(n+1)\frac{1-\alpha}{2}},\end{aligned}$$

similarly as in subcase 1.2. □

Lemma 4.14. *Let $\alpha \in (0,1)$, $0 \le V \in L^1_{loc}(X,\mu)$, and $\mathcal{I}(V)$ is as in Proposition 4.5. Then the pair $(V,\mathcal{I}(V))$ satisfies (K).*

Proof. **Case 1:** $\rho(0,I) \le 2\,|I|$. In this case $\mu(I) \simeq |I|^{1+\alpha}$. Using (2.3) and (2.2),

$$\int_0^{2t}\int_{I^{***}} P_s(x,y)V(y)\,d\mu(y)\,ds \le C\int_0^{2t} s^{-\frac{1+\alpha}{2}}ds \cdot \int_{I^{***}} V\,d\mu \le Ct^{\frac{1-\alpha}{2}}\frac{\mu(I)}{|I|^2} \le C\left(\frac{t}{|I|^2}\right)^{\frac{1-\alpha}{2}}.$$

Case 2: $\rho(0,I) > 2\,|I|$. In this case $\mu(I) \simeq |I|c_I^{\alpha}$, where c_I denotes the center of I. Using (2.3) and the doubling condition,

$$\begin{aligned}\int_0^{2t}\int_{I^{***}} P_s(x,y)V(y)\,d\mu(y)\,ds &\le C\int_0^{2t}\int_{I^{***}} \mu(B(y,\sqrt{s}))^{-1}V(y)d\mu(y)ds\\ &\le C\int_0^{2t} s^{-\frac{1}{2}}c_I^{-\alpha}ds \cdot \int_{I^{***}} V(y)d\mu(y)\\ &\le Ct^{\frac{1}{2}}\frac{\mu(I)}{|I|^2}c_I^{-\alpha} \le C\left(\frac{t}{|I|^2}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}.\end{aligned}$$

□

Combining Lemmas 4.6 and 4.14 we obtain Theorem 1.9.

Appendix

The goal of this Appendix is to give a precise proof of the formula (4.9). Recall that $J = (a, b)$. By the definition of ϕ_I we have

(4.15)
$$\phi_I(x) = 1 + \frac{1}{2(1-\alpha)} \begin{cases} \int_J V(y) y^{1-\alpha}\, d\mu(y) - x^{1-\alpha} \int_J V(y)\, d\mu(y), & x < a \\ \int_a^x V(y)(x^{1-\alpha} - y^{1-\alpha})\, d\mu(y) - \int_x^b V(y)(y^{1-\alpha} - x^{1-\alpha})\, d\mu(y), & x \in (a,b) \\ x^{1-\alpha} \int_J V(y)\, d\mu(y) - \int_J V(y) y^{1-\alpha}\, d\mu(y), & x > b. \end{cases}$$

Recall that $\int_J V = \mu(J)|J|^{-2}$. The formula (4.15) easily implies that

$$|\phi_I'(x)| \le C\mu(J)|J|^{-2} x^{-\alpha} \tag{4.16}$$

for all $x \in X$.

Lemma 4.17. *Let $\psi \in \mathrm{Dom}(Q)$, $\psi \ge 0$, $\eta \in C_c^\infty(X,\mu)$, $\eta \equiv 1$ on $\mathrm{supp}(\psi)$. Then $\phi_I \eta \in \mathrm{Dom}(Q)$ and*

$$Q(\psi, \phi_I \eta) = \int_X \psi(x) V(x) (\phi_I(x) - \mathbb{1}_J(x))\, d\mu(x) \ge 0.$$

Proof. Observe that using (4.15) we obtain that

$$-\phi_I''(x) - \frac{\alpha}{x}\phi_I'(x) = -\mathbb{1}_J(x) V(x).$$

Since $\mathrm{supp}(\eta)$ is compact, using facts (4.8), (4.16) we deduce that $\phi_I \eta \in \mathrm{Dom}(Q)$. Since $\eta \equiv 1$ on $\mathrm{supp}\,(\psi)$,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_X \psi'(x)(\phi_I(x)\eta(x))'\, d\mu(x) &= \int_X \psi'(x)\phi_I'(x)\, d\mu(x) \\ &= \int_X \psi(x) \left(-\phi_I''(x) - \frac{\alpha}{x}\phi_I'(x) \right) d\mu(x) \\ &= -\int_X \psi(x) \mathbb{1}_J(x) V(x)\, d\mu(x). \end{aligned}$$

The lemma follows, since $\phi_I \ge 1$. □

Recall that $z \in J$ is fixed and denote $\vartheta(u) = K_u \phi_I(z)$. Our goal is to prove that $\vartheta(t+s) \le \vartheta(t)$ for $t, s > 0$.

Denote $k(x) := K_t(x,z) = K_{t/2}(K_{t/2}(\cdot, z))(x)$. Since the semigroup K_t is analytic and $K_{t/2}(\cdot, z) \in L^2(X,\mu)$ (see (1.3) and (2.3)), we have $k \in \mathrm{Dom}(\mathbf{L}) \subset \mathrm{Dom}(Q)$. Let $\eta_n \to \mathbb{1}_X$, $\eta_n \in C_c^\infty(X,\mu)$, $\mathrm{supp}(\eta_n) \subset (0, n+1]$, $\eta_n \equiv 1$ on $(0,n]$, and $\|\eta_n'\|_\infty + \|\eta_n''\|_\infty \le C$.

First, observe that

$$(K_u(k)\eta_n)'(\phi_I \eta_{n+1})' = (K_u(k)\eta_n)'\phi_I' = K_u(k)'\phi_I'\eta_n + K_u(k)\phi_I'\eta_n'.$$

Using this,

(4.18)
$$\begin{aligned} Q(K_u(k), \phi_I\eta_n) &= \int K_u(k)'(\phi_I\eta_n)'\, d\mu + \int V K_u(k)\phi_I\eta_n\, d\mu \\ &= \int K_u(k)'\phi_I'\eta_n\, d\mu + \int K_u(k)'\phi_I\eta_n'\, d\mu + \int V K_u(k)\phi_I\eta_n\, d\mu \\ &= \int (K_u(k)\eta_n)'(\phi_I\eta_{n+1})'\, d\mu - \int K_u(k)\phi_I'\eta_n'\, d\mu + \int K_u(k)'\phi_I\eta_n'\, d\mu \\ &\quad + \int V(K_u(k)\eta_n)(\phi_I\eta_{n+1})\, d\mu \\ &= Q(K_u(k)\eta_n, \phi_I\eta_{n+1}) - 2\int K_u(k)\phi_I'\eta_n'\, d\mu - \int K_u(k)\phi_I\eta_n''\, d\mu - \int K_u(k)\phi_I\eta_n'\frac{\alpha}{x}\, d\mu \\ &= Q(K_u(k)\eta_n, \phi_I\eta_{n+1}) - 2B_1 - B_2 - B_3. \end{aligned}$$

Proposition 4.19. *The function ϑ is non-increasing.*

Proof. Using (4.18),

$$\begin{aligned}
\vartheta(t+s)-\vartheta(t) &= \int_X \left(K_s(k)-k\right)(x)\phi_I(x)\,d\mu(x)\\
&= \lim_{n\to\infty}\int_X (K_s(k)-k)(x)\phi_I(x)\eta_n(x)\,d\mu(x)\\
&= \lim_{n\to\infty}\int_X \left(\int_0^s (-\mathbf{L})K_u(k)(x)\,du\right)\phi_I(x)\eta_n(x)\,d\mu(x)\\
&= -\lim_{n\to\infty}\int_0^s\int_X \mathbf{L}K_u(k)(x)\phi_I(x)\eta_n(x)\,d\mu(x)\,du\\
&= -\lim_{n\to\infty}\int_0^s Q(K_u(k),\phi_I\eta_n)\,du\\
&= -\lim_{n\to\infty}\int_0^s \left(Q(K_u(k)\eta_n,\phi_I\eta_{n+1})-2B_1-B_2-B_3\right)\,du.
\end{aligned}$$

Having in mind Lemma 4.17 it is enough to show that $\int_0^s B_i\,du\to 0$ as $n\to\infty$ for $i=1,2,3$. This follows from Lebesgue's Dominated Convergence Theorem and the estimates we have already established. For example, for B_2 observe that $|\phi_I(x)\eta_n''(x)|\le C\mu(J)|J|^{-2}|x|^{1-\alpha}\mathbb{1}_{[n,n+1]}(x)$ for $n\ge N$ with N large enough. Then the majorant is

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_0^s\int_X \sup_{n\ge N}|K_u(k)(x)\phi_I(x)\eta_n''(x)|\,d\mu(x)\,du &\le C\int_0^s\int_X \frac{|x|^{1-\alpha}}{\mu(B(x,\sqrt{t+u}))}\exp\left(-\frac{|x-z|^2}{c_2(t+u)}\right)x^\alpha\,dx\,du\\
&\le C\int_0^s\int_X \frac{|x|^{1-\alpha}}{(t+u)^{1/2}}\left(\frac{x}{x+\sqrt{t+u}}\right)^\alpha\exp\left(-\frac{|x-z|^2}{c_2(t+u)}\right)dx\,du\\
&\le Ct^{-1/2}s\int_X |x|^{1-\alpha}\exp\left(-\frac{|x-z|^2}{c_2(t+s)}\right)dx\\
&\le C(I,t,s).
\end{aligned}$$

The integrals with B_3 and B_1 goes similarly. For the latter one we use (4.16). □

Acknowledgments: The authors would like to thank Jacek Dziubański for his helpful remarks.

References

1. Pascal Auscher and Besma Ben Ali, *Maximal inequalities and Riesz transform estimates on L^p spaces for Schrödinger operators with nonnegative potentials*, Ann. Inst. Fourier (Grenoble) **57** (2007), no. 6, 1975–2013. MR 2377893
2. Pascal Auscher, Xuan Thinh Duong, and Alan McIntosh, *Boundedness of banach space valued singular integral operators and hardy spaces*, unpublished preprint, 2005.
3. Frédéric Bernicot and Jiman Zhao, *New abstract Hardy spaces*, J. Funct. Anal. **255** (2008), no. 7, 1761–1796. MR 2442082
4. Jorge J. Betancor, Jacek Dziubański, and Jose Luis Torrea, *On Hardy spaces associated with Bessel operators*, J. Anal. Math. **107** (2009), 195–219. MR 2496404 (2010e:42015)
5. The Anh Bui, *Functions of vanishing mean oscillation associated to non-negative self-adjoint operators satisfying Davies-Gaffney estimates*, Tohoku Math. J. (2) **66** (2014), no. 2, 269–287. MR 3229597
6. Ronald R. Coifman and Guido Weiss, *Extensions of Hardy spaces and their use in analysis*, Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. **83** (1977), no. 4, 569–645. MR 0447954 (56 #6264)
7. Wojciech Czaja and Jacek Zienkiewicz, *Atomic characterization of the Hardy space $H^1_L(\mathbb{R})$ of one-dimensional Schrödinger operators with nonnegative potentials*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **136** (2008), no. 1, 89–94 (electronic). MR 2350392 (2009f:42019)
8. Donggao Deng, Xuan Thinh Duong, Liang Song, Chaoqiang Tan, and Lixin Yan, *Functions of vanishing mean oscillation associated with operators and applications*, Michigan Math. J. **56** (2008), no. 3, 529–550. MR 2488724
9. Xuan Thinh Duong and Lixin Yan, *Duality of Hardy and BMO spaces associated with operators with heat kernel bounds*, J. Amer. Math. Soc. **18** (2005), no. 4, 943–973 (electronic). MR 2163867
10. Jacek Dziubański and Marcin Preisner, *Remarks on spectral multiplier theorems on Hardy spaces associated with semigroups of operators*, Rev. Un. Mat. Argentina **50** (2009), no. 2, 201–215. MR 2656536 (2011d:42053)
11. ———, *Riesz transform characterization of Hardy spaces associated with Schrödinger operators with compactly supported potentials*, Ark. Mat. **48** (2010), no. 2, 301–310. MR 2672611 (2011i:35036)

12. ———, *On Riesz transforms characterization of H^1 spaces associated with some Schrödinger operators*, Potential Anal. **35** (2011), no. 1, 39–50. MR 2804551 (2012e:42035)
13. Jacek Dziubański, Marcin Preisner, and Błażej Wróbel, *Multivariate Hörmander-type multiplier theorem for the Hankel transform*, J. Fourier Anal. Appl. **19** (2013), no. 2, 417–437. MR 3034771
14. Jacek Dziubański and Jacek Zienkiewicz, *Hardy spaces H^1 for Schrödinger operators with certain potentials*, Studia Math. **164** (2004), no. 1, 39–53. MR 2079769 (2005f:47097)
15. ———, *Hardy spaces H^1 for Schrödinger operators with compactly supported potentials*, Ann. Mat. Pura Appl. (4) **184** (2005), no. 3, 315–326. MR 2164260 (2006d:42041)
16. ———, *On Hardy spaces associated with certain Schrödinger operators in dimension 2*, Rev. Mat. Iberoam. **28** (2012), no. 4, 1035–1060. MR 2990133
17. ———, *On isomorphisms of Hardy spaces associated with Schrödinger operators*, J. Fourier Anal. Appl. **19** (2013), no. 3, 447–456. MR 3048584
18. ———, *A characterization of Hardy spaces associated with certain Schrödinger operators*, Potential Anal. **41** (2014), no. 3, 917–930. MR 3264827
19. David Goldberg, *A local version of real Hardy spaces*, Duke Math. J. **46** (1979), no. 1, 27–42. MR 523600 (80h:46052)
20. Loukas Grafakos, LiGuang Liu, and DaChun Yang, *Maximal function characterizations of Hardy spaces on RD-spaces and their applications*, Sci. China Ser. A **51** (2008), no. 12, 2253–2284. MR 2462027
21. Steve Hofmann, Guozhen Lu, Dorina Mitrea, Marius Mitrea, and Lixin Yan, *Hardy spaces associated to non-negative self-adjoint operators satisfying Davies-Gaffney estimates*, Mem. Amer. Math. Soc. **214** (2011), no. 1007, vi+78. MR 2868142
22. Robert H. Latter, *A characterization of $H^p(\mathbf{R}^n)$ in terms of atoms*, Studia Math. **62** (1978), no. 1, 93–101. MR 0482111 (58 #2198)
23. Marcin Preisner, *Riesz transform characterization of H^1 spaces associated with certain Laguerre expansions*, J. Approx. Theory **164** (2012), no. 2, 229–252. MR 2864644 (2012k:42043)
24. ———, *Atomic decompositions for Hardy spaces related to Schrödinger operators*, arXiv:1409.4612 (2014), preprint.
25. Zhong Wei Shen, *L^p estimates for Schrödinger operators with certain potentials*, Ann. Inst. Fourier (Grenoble) **45** (1995), no. 2, 513–546. MR 1343560

Edyta Kania
Instytut Matematyczny, Uniwersytet Wrocławski
pl. Grunwaldzki 2/4, 50-384 Wrocław, Poland

E-mail address: edyta.kania@math.uni.wroc.pl

Marcin Preisner
Instytut Matematyczny, Uniwersytet Wrocławski
pl. Grunwaldzki 2/4, 50-384 Wrocław, Poland

E-mail address: marcin.preisner@math.uni.wroc.pl